



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.      |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 09/942,622   | 08/31/2001  | Takeshi Saito        | 213505US2RD         | 8762                  |
| 22850  | 7590        | 10/22/2007           | EXAMINER            |                       |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.<br>1940 DUKE STREET<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 |             |                      | WIN, AUNG T         |                       |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     | 2617                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     | 10/22/2007 ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 09/942,622             | SAITO, TAKESHI      |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Aung T. Win            | 2617                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/26/2007.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 & 16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 & 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo (US006629136B1) in view of Wilson (US007007080B2), further in view of Lemilainen et al (US006766160B1).

2.1 Regarding Claims 1, 4 & 16, Naidoo discloses a portable terminal [400: Figure 4] [Column 11, Line 12-23] in an information distribution system using a local server [Web Server 120: See Figure 2] accessible through a local wireless network 110 (i.e., short distance communication) [Column 6, Line 55-Column 7, Line 26] for accessing local information [Column 8, Line 1-25] provided by local server. Naidoo also discloses the user registers over the phone for access local information [Column 8, Line 51-60;

Column 11, Line 30-37]. Therefore, it is obvious to skilled in the art that telephone server is the claimed subscription server. Naidoo also teaches other limitations in the claims. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the terminal must be integrated with

local radio network interface and local server access request unit because Naidoo teaches that mobile terminal is configured to request for accessing geographic location based information.

public network interface and membership subscription request unit in order to access the telephone server via public telephone network for local information access registration as provided in received membership guidance such as telephone number to access to the telephone subscription server (i.e., an address of subscription server) because Naidoo discloses that the user is given an option to register over the phone [Column 8, Line 51-59] if the local information access is denied. Naidoo does not explicitly teach terminal ID for identifying the mobile terminal.

Wilson teaches the method for restricting mobile user to access a web server based on configured and identified IP address (i.e., claimed terminal ID). Wilson further teaches that the user who has not registered for the service is redirected to the registration screen or a mail message with directions to the registration screen [Column 5, Line 59-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to modify local information access restriction method as taught by Wilson for identifying mobile terminal ID. One of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2617

time of invention of made to do this to determine the user privilege to access local network based on identified IP address for requesting local information.

The terminal as modified above does not explicitly teach that the terminal is integrated with both of a local radio network interface configured to access the local server through the local radio network and a public network interface configured to access the subscription server through a public network. Lemilainen teaches the mobile terminal with a local radio network interface to access to LAN and cellular interface to access to public telephone network via cellular network [Figure 1].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the terminal with two interfaces as taught by Lemilainen to carry out the registration for account through the public telephone network via cellular network using the same terminal as cited in Claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to facilitate communications with multiple communications network for user conveniences by providing dual mode wireless terminal.

2.2 Claim 2 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 1 rejection.

Naidoo teaches registration over the phone, online, or mail for accessing local information web page. Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that domain name of the local server (i.e., local server ID) must be provided in order to identify the local server providing local information during local information access registration.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo (US006629136B1) in view of Wilson (US007007080B2), further in view of Coppinger et al. (US20010046862A1).

3.1 Regarding Claim 3, Naidoo discloses that a password is provided to user to access to local information provided by the local server [Column 8, Line 51-59]. Naidoo does not explicitly teach receiving password with a limited valid period from the subscription server and further storing the received password.

Coppinger discloses the account registration of a wireless device for new service in which, the user is provided with system assigned password by the server (subscription sever) [Paragraph 0059, 0060 & 0066] in which password is used for limited access to the registered service [See "... the new service request which is available for use beginning at a specified time or event; and to be specified to ceased being available for use at a specified time; Paragraph 0079] [Figure 1].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the mobile station and registration method as taught by Coppinger to access local server with stored limited access password as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to simplify the registering process with storing password feature.

Art Unit: 2617

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aung T. Win whose telephone number is (571) 272-7549. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aung T. Win  
Group Art Unit 2617  
October 12, 2007

*Aung T. Win*  
DUC M. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600